

Panaji, 21st May, 2009 (Vaisakha 31, 1931)

SERIES II No. 8

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Note:- There are two Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 7 dated 14-3-2009, as follows:-

- 1) *Extraordinary dated 15-5-2009 from pages 119 to 120 regarding Notifications from Department of Elections (Goa State Election Commission).*
- 2) *Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 16-5-2009 from pages 121 to 122 regarding Notification from Department of Elections (Office of the Chief Electoral Officer).*

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Education, Art & Culture

Directorate of Technical Education

Order

No. DTE/ADC/11/1/43/2008/333

Read: Memorandum No. DTE/ADC/11/1/43/2008/560 dated 28-5-2008.

On the recommendations of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/I/5/33(1)/94/311 dated 29-11-2007, Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Arun Bhimrao Joshi on temporary basis as Professor in Pharmacognosy (Group 'A' Gazetted) in the Goa College of Pharmacy, Panaji-Goa in the pay scale of Rs. 16,400-450-22,400 as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above.

The basic pay of Dr. Arun Bhimrao Joshi will be Rs. 17,750/- with effect from the date of joining. This issues with approval of Finance Department vide U. O. No. 2615-F dated 26-9-2008.

Dr. Arun Bhimrao Joshi will be on probation for a period of two years.

He has been declared fit by Medical Board, Goa Medical College vide letter No. 4/105/85-H/GMC/2009/9 dated 17-02-2009. His character and antecedents have been verified by Addl. District

Magistrate, D. K. Mangalore and nothing adverse has been found.

He should join duties on or before 31st August, 2009 failing which this order is liable to be cancelled without further notice.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vivek B. Kamat, Director of Technical Education & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Porvorim, 14th May, 2009.

Department of Labour

Notification

No. 28/1/2009-IAB/420

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, at Panaji-Goa on 06-03-2009 in reference No. IT/58/03 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

B. S. Kudalkar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 21st April, 2009.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I AT PANAJI

(Before Smt. Anuja Prabhudessai, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/58/03

Workmen,
Rep. by Kadamba Kamgar Union,
T-1, Sindhur Bldg.,
Opp. Passport Office,
Panaji, Goa.

... Workmen/Party I

V/s

M/s. Kadamba Transport
Corporation Ltd.,
P. O. Box 321,
East Wing Bus Terminus,
Panaji, Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I is represented by Adv. A. Kundaikar.

Employer/Party II is represented by Adv. C. J. Mane.

A WARD

(Passed on this 6th day of March, 2009)

By order dated 6-8-04, Government of Goa has referred the following dispute for adjudication of this Tribunal.

"(1) Whether the demand of Kadamba Kamgar Union for regularization of the following workpersons on their respective completion of 240 days of continuous service, is legal and justified?

1. Shri Raju Borkar.
2. Shri Mangaldas Naik.
3. Shri Basavraj Chigre.
4. Shri Tiefert Fernandes.
5. Shri Polly Fernandes.
6. Shri Minino Fernandes.
7. Shri Arnold D'Costa.
8. Shri Ligario D'Costa.
9. Shri Joaquim Dias.
10. Shri Nazir Khan.
11. Shri Valentans Barretto.
12. Shri Santosh Dessai.
13. Shri Shivanand Naik.
14. Shri Krishnanath Salgaonkar.
15. Shri Mohan Ghadi.
16. Shri Surendra Naik.
17. Shri Manguesh R. Naik.
18. Shri Minin Vaz.
19. Shri Narendra Borke.
20. Shri Rama Devidas.
21. Shri Sandip Narvekar.

(2) If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?

2. On receipt of the said reference IT/58/03 was registered. Notices were issued to both parties. The Party I filed its claim statement at Exb. 3. The Party II filed its written statement at Exb. 5. The rejoinder is at Exb. 6.

3. It is not in dispute that the Party II had issued advertisement in the local newspapers for the posts of drivers. The Party I workmen have stated that their names were sponsored by the

employment exchange. The Party I has stated that the drivers were selected as heavy vehicle drivers on an understanding that their services would be regularized in three months. The Party I workmen have stated that they were appointed against existing vacancies and they were recruited for permanent work. The grievance of the Party I is that these drivers were not regularized after completion of service of 240 days or three months but the services of the drivers were regularized in batches from 2001 to 2002. The Party I drivers have stated that the drivers who were regularized in the first batch i.e. in the year 2001 are drawing higher salary as compared to the Party I drivers who were regularized subsequently.

The contention of the Party I drivers is that they were entitled to be regularized on completion of continuous service of 240 days. The Party I drivers have claimed that they have sustained monetary loss on account of the delay in regularizing of their services and that fixing pay scale in batches is illegal and amounts to victimization and unfair labour practice. The Party I workmen have stated that they are entitled for regularization of services on completion of 240 days of continuous service, with all consequential regularization benefits.

4. The Party II has stated that the appointment of the drivers was necessitated on account of temporary increase in the workload. The Party II has stated that the services of these workmen were regularized depending upon availability of posts and on the basis of satisfactory work performance. The Party II has denied that it has indulged in unfair labour practice or victimization. The Party II has denied that the services of Party I drivers had to be regularized on completion of 240 days of continuous service.

5. Based on the aforesaid pleading following issues were framed:

1. Whether the Party I union proves that the workmen are entitled to the regularization of their services on their respective completion of 240 days continuous service?
2. Whether the Employer/Party II proves that the workmen, Shri Polly Fernandes and Shri Ligorio D'Costa have left the services and hence no relief can be granted to them?
3. Whether the workmen are entitled to any relief?
4. What Award?

6. Learned advocate, Shri Kundaikar has argued that pursuant to the advertisement issued by the Party II, several drivers were appointed on permanent basis. He has argued that some of these drivers were regularized in June, 2001 while the Party I drivers wereregularized subsequently in different batches. He has argued that regularization of services in batches of the similarly placed workmen has resulted in disparity in the wages drawn by the drivers. He has argued that the Party I drivers were entitled for regularization on completion on 240 days.

7. Learned Adv., Shri Mane has argued on behalf of the Party II Corporation. He has argued that the drivers were appointed on daily wages due to temporary increase in the workload. He has argued that though these drivers were appointed on daily wages, they were given all benefits which were given to the permanent employees and that their services have been regularized depending upon the availability of posts and satisfactory work performance. He has argued that the Party I drivers are not entitled for regularization on completion of 240 days of service. I have perused the records and considered the arguments advanced by the respective parties and my findings on the issues are as under.

8 *Issue No. 1:* It is not in dispute that the Party II had issued an advertisement in local daily at Exb. 18 stating that it required heavy vehicle drivers. The advertisement stated that initially the appointment would be on daily wages for three months and thereafter would be made on regular basis subject to satisfactory performance. The Party I has stated that pursuant to this advertisement the names of the Party I/Workman drivers were sponsored by the employment exchange for the posts of drivers and they were selected and were appointed by the Party II on daily wages of Rs. 100/- per day of actual work. The evidence of Avinash Rawal, the President of the union indicates that the Party I drivers were appointed in April, 1999 against existing vacancies and the services of these Party I drivers wereregularized in batches from 2001 to 2001. Some of these drivers were regularized on 1-4-2001 and 1-9-2001 and some were regularized on 15-1-02, 1-4-2002 and 1-6-2002 and the delay in regularizing their services has resulted in disparity in the pay scales. He has deposed that the Party I drives were deprived of the monetary benefits on account of delay in regularization of their services. He has deposed that Party I drivers were entitled for regularization on completion of 240 days of continuous service. He

has stated that the Party I drivers were appointed on regular vacancies and that they were recruited on permanent jobs and that to deny regularization and keep them on daily wages perpetually is unjust and arbitrary and amounts to unfair labour practice.

9. It may be mentioned here that AW1 Avinash Rawal had denied that the Party I drivers were appointed on daily wages due to increase in workload and growing absenteeism. He has also denied the suggestion that the Party I drivers were regularized as and when there were regular vacancies. It is however to be noted that the second witness of the Party I, Shri Andrew Lopes has admitted in his cross examination that the Party II had appointed temporary drivers on account of pressure of work. He has admitted that some of the drivers were regularized in different batches. The witness No. 2, Andrew Lopes has also admitted in his cross examination that the Party II had not assured the Party I drivers at the time of their appointment that their services would be regularized on completion of 240 days of continuous service. The evidence of this witness clearly fortifies the case of the Party II that the Party I drivers were appointed on daily wages only due to exigencies of work and consequently the evidence of AW2 Andrew Lopes belies the contention of the AW1 Avinash Rawal that these drivers were appointed on existing vacancies.

10. It is also to be noted that though the Party I drivers have stated that they were entitled for regularization on completion of 240 days, they have not produced any appointment letter to show that the Party II had undertaken to regularize their services on completion of 3 months or 240 days. On the contrary, the Party II has produced the appointment letter (Exb. 20) issued to Raju Borkar, the Party I drivers at Sr. No.1, a perusal of which clearly indicates that the Party I driver, Raju Borkar was appointed as a substitute driver on daily wages. The said appointment letter also indicates that the appointment was necessitated due to the temporary increase in work and that the services are liable to be terminated at any time during the temporary period of employment without assigning any reason. The evidence of Shri Anand Shirvoikar, the witness for the Party II, also indicates that these drivers were taken on daily wages only because of increase in work which was mainly because of absenteeism of regular drivers. The appointment letter at Exb. 20 viz-a-viz the evidence of Shri Anand Shirvoikar clearly indicates that the Party I drivers were

appointed purely on temporary basis. This being the case it is evident that the Party I drivers were not appointed on regular vacancies but were appointed as temporary workmen within the meaning of Clause 3(c) of the Certified Standing Orders of the Corporation.

11. It is to be noted that since the Party I drivers were temporary workmen they had no right to the post and they were not entitled for regularization of their services merely because they had completed 240 days of continuous services. Even otherwise Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act does not stipulate regularization of services on completion of 240 days. In the case of *Gangadhar Pillai v/s Siemens Ltd., 2007 (1) SCC 533*, the apex court has held that *"It is not the law that on completion of 240 days of continuous service in a year, the concerned employee becomes entitled to for regularization of his services and/or permanent status. The concept of 240 days in a year was introduced in the industrial law for a definite purpose. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, the concept of 240 days was introduced so as to fasten a statutory liabilities upon the employer to pay compensation to be computed in the manner specified in Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 before he is retrenched from services and not for any other purpose. In the event a violation of the said provision takes place, termination of services of the employee may be found to be illegal, but only on that account, his services cannot be directed to be regularized."* Similarly, in the case of *Mehboob Deepak v/s Nagar Panchayat Gajrauta and reported in 2008 (1) SCC 575* and the case of *Branch Manager, M.P. State Agro Industries Development Corporation Ltd., and another v/s S.C. Pandey reported in 2006 (II) SCC 716* and *M.P. Housing Board v/s Manoj Shrivastava (2006) 2 SCC 702* the apex court has reiterated that only because the employee has been working for more than 240 days he does not derive any legal right to be regularized in service.

12. Thus the principles laid down in the aforesaid decisions are sufficient to negate the contention of the Party I that they were entitled for regularization on completion of 240 days of continuous service. The evidence of witness for the Party II clearly indicates that though these drivers were appointed as temporary drivers they were given all benefits given to the permanent drivers and that the services of the Party I drivers wereregularized as and when the vacancies arose and on considering the work performance of these drivers. This being the

case there is no substance in the contention of the Party I drivers that the Party II had indulged in victimization or unfair labour practice. Hence the issue No. 1 is answered in negative.

13. *Issue No. 2:* Since the Party I drivers were not entitled for regularization in service on completion of 240 days of continuous service they are not entitled for any relief as claimed. Under the circumstances and in view of discussion supra, I pass the following order.

ORDER

The demand of Kadamba Kamgar Union for regularization of the services of 21 workmen named in the reference on completion of 240 days of continuous service is not legal and justified. The Party I drivers are not entitled for any relief.

No order as to costs. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-
(A. Prabhudessai),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
-Labour Court-I.

Notification

No. 28/1/2009-IAB/436

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, at Panaji-Goa on 30-03-2009 in reference No. IT/45/00 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

B. S. Kudalkar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2009.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT-I AT PANAJI

(Before Smt. Anuja Prabhudessai, Presiding
Officer)

Case No. IT/45/00

Shri Keshav Harmalkar,
H. No. 51/3, Karaswada,
Bardez, Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s. Geno Pharmaceuticals Limited,

Thivim Industrial Estate,

Thivim, Karaswada,

Bardez, Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Workman/Party I is represented by Adv. R. P. Gawthankar.

Employer/Party II is represented by Adv. M. S. Bandothkar.

A WARD

(Passed on this 30th day of March, 2009)

By order dated 28-06-2000, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred to this Industrial Tribunal the following dispute for adjudication:

"(1) Whether Shri Keshav Harmalkar, Foreman with M/s. Geno Pharmaceuticals Ltd., could be construed as "workman" as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)?

(2) (i) If answer to the above is in the affirmative then whether the action of the management of M/s. Geno Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Thivim Industrial Estate, Karaswada, Mapusa, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Keshav Harmalkar with effect from 31-12-1999 is legal and justified?

(ii) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference notices were issued to both parties. Party I filed his claim statement at Exb. 3. The Party II filed its written statement at Exb. 7 and the rejoinder of the Party I is at Exb. 8.

3. The Party I was appointed by the Party II as a Junior Process Worker. Subsequently, the Party I was promoted to the post of Maintenance Foreman w.e.f. 1-11-1988. The Party I has stated that as a Maintenance Foreman he reported to the Production Manager. The Party I was issued a charge sheet dated 18-2-1996. The enquiry was conducted and the Party I was guilty of the charges specified in the charge sheet. The services of the Party I were terminated w.e.f. 31-12-99. The Party I has stated that the enquiry conducted against him was not fair and proper and that the findings of the enquiry officer are not based on material on record. The Party I has further stated that the termination order is illegal and unjustified and is by way of victimization and unfair labour

practice. The Party I has therefore sought re-instatement with all consequential benefits.

4. The Party II has denied that the Party I is a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Party II has stated that the Party I was a Foreman and was performing supervisory and administrative duties. The Party II has further stated that the Party I had committed acts of misconduct such as, theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employers business or property. Enquiry in respect of the said charges was conducted. The Party I was given full opportunity to defend himself in respect of the said charges. The Party II has further stated that the enquiry was held in compliance with the principles of the natural justice. The Party II has further stated that the enquiry officer has held the Party I guilty of the charges levelled and that the said findings are based on material on record. The Party II has therefore claimed that the Party I is not entitled for any relief.

5. Based on the aforesaid pleading, following issues were framed:

1. Whether the Party I proves that he is a "workman" within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
2. Whether the Party I proves that the domestic enquiry held against him is not fair and proper?
3. Whether the charges of misconduct levelled against the Party I are proved to the satisfaction of the Tribunal by acceptable evidence?
4. Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating his services with effect from 31-12-1999 is illegal, unjustified and by way of victimization and unfair labour practice?
5. Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?
6. What Award?

6. During the pendency of the reference the Party I expired and the legal representatives of the Party I were brought on record. On 12-3-09 the heirs of the Party I alongwith their representative and the Party II remained present before the Tribunal and filed a joint application at Exb. 28 stating that the matter has been amicably settled as per the terms incorporated in the application at Exb. 28. The said terms are agreeable to both parties and in my opinion the same are in the interest of the legal representatives of the Party I. Hence the consent terms are taken on record and the consent award is passed as under.

ORDER

1 It is agreed between the parties that the Management of M/s. Geno Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Karaswada, Mapusa, Goa shall pay a sum of Rs. 1,50,000/- (One lakh fifty thousand only) to the legal heirs of Shri Keshav Harmalkar by cheque No. 850214 dated 20-2-2009 drawn on Syndicate Bank, Mapusa Branch, Goa which shall include all his claims arising out of the present reference No. IT/45/00 and his employment, including any claims of earned wages, bonus, gratuity, leave encashment, ex-gratia etc. or any other claim which can be computed in terms of money.

2. It is agreed that the legal heirs of Shri Keshav Harmalkar shall accept the said amount as mentioned in the Clause (1) hereinabove in full and final settlement of all his claims arising out of the present reference and arising out of his employment including any claim of earned wages, bonus, gratuity, leave encashment, ex-gratia, etc. or any other claim what can be computed in terms of money, in complete satisfaction of all their claims including the claim made in the present Reference No. IT/45/00 and further confirm that he shall have no claim whatsoever nature against the company including any claim of re-instatement and/or re-employment.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Anuja Prabhudessai),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
-Labour Court-I.

Notification

No. 28/1/2009-IAB/436

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, at Panaji-Goa on 20-03-2009 in reference No. IT/85/00 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

B. S. Kudalkar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 27th April, 2009.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I AT PANAJI

(Before Smt. Anuja Prabhudessai, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)

Ref. No. IT/85/00

Shri Jairam K. Parab,
Parabwada, Kasarwaram,
Pernem, Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s

M/s. Kadamba Transport
Corporation Ltd.,
Panaji, Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Party I/Workman – None present.

Party II/Employer is represented by Adv. A. Palekar.

A WARD

(Passed on this 20th day of March, 2009)

By order dated 24-11-2000, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act had referred the following dispute for adjudication of this Tribunal.

"(1) Whether the action of the Kadamba Transport Corporation Ltd., Panaji, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Jairam K. Parab, driver with effect from 7-12-93 is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

2. On receipt of the reference IT/85/00 was registered. Notices were issued to both parties. Party I has filed claim statement at Exb. 4. The Party II has filed written statement at Exb. 6. The rejoinder is at Exb. 8.

3. The Party I has stated that he was appointed as a heavy vehicle driver. He was issued a charge sheet dated 5-11-1993. He had replied to the said charge sheet and denied charges levelled against him. Subsequently services of the Party I were terminated on 7-12-1993. An appeal filed by the Party I was dismissed by the appellate authority. The Party I has stated that the termination is arbitrary, malafide and illegal. The Party I has therefore sought re-instatement with full back wages.

4. The Party II has stated that the Party I was appointed as a substitute driver owing to temporary increase in work. He was negligent and careless in discharging duties for which reasons, charge sheet was issued to him. The Party II has stated that it was not necessary to conduct an enquiry since the Party I was appointed as a substitute driver and his performance was not

satisfactory and as such his services were terminated w.e.f. 7-12-93.

5. Based on the aforesaid pleadings following issues were framed:

- 1 Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating his services w.e.f. 7-12-1993 is illegal and unjustified?
- 2 Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief?
- 3 What Award?

6. The records indicate that the matter was pending for evidence since 21-10-01. Despite several opportunities given, the Party I has not stepped into the witness box and has not adduced any evidence to prove his case. Needless to state that having raised a dispute, the onus was on the Party I to prove that his termination was illegal. The Party I had failed to adduce such evidence and in the absence of such evidence his termination cannot be said to be illegal hence issue No. 1 is answered in the negative. Consequently the Party I is not entitled for any relief. Hence issue No. 2 is also answered in the negative.

Under the circumstances and in view of discussion supra, I pass the following order.

ORDER

The Party I has failed to prove that his termination is legal and justified. It is held that the Party I is not entitled for any relief.

No order as to costs. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(A. Prabhudessai),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
-Labour Court-I.

Department of Law and Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division

Corrigendum

No. 6-28-92/LD-(Misc)/573

Read: Government Notification No. 6-28-92/LD-(Misc.-I)/350 dated 17-03-2009.

In the above referred Notification the name of the constituent of South Goa District Legal Services

Authority at serial No. 1 shall be read as Shri M. A. Todurkar instead of Shri M. A. Torudkar.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

N. P. Singnapurker, Under Secretary (Estt.).

Porvorim, 14th May, 2009.

Notification by the High Court of Judicature Appellate Side, Bombay

No. A. 3902/G/2009

The Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges are pleased to make the following postings:-

Civil Judge, Senior Division

Sr. No.	Name and present posting	New posting
1	Shri P. M. Shinde, Civil Judge, Senior Division and J. M. F. C., Margao	Civil Judge, Senior Division & C. J. M., Panaji vice Shri C. Fernandes.
2	Shri C. Fernandes, Civil Judge, Senior Division and C. J. M., Panaji	Civil Judge, Senior Division & J. M. F. C., Margao vice Shri P. M. Shinde.

Civil Judge, Junior Division & JMFC

Sr. No.	Name and present posting	New posting
1	Shri Cholu M. Gauns, Civil Judge, Junior Division & JMFC, Quepem-Margao	Civil Judge, Junior Division & JMFC, Mapusa, District Panaji.

High Court, Bombay
Dated: 12th May, 2009.

A. I. S. Cheema,
Registrar General.

Department of Printing and Stationery

Order

No. 9/138/91/Vol.I/GPS/351

After introducing the four colour printing in the Printing Press, Rates of four colour printing to be charged with departments are as follows:-

- 1 Printing done on Digital printer and coverage is less than 5%
- Rs. 2/- per A4 size paper.

- 2 Coverage is more Rs. 6/- per A4 size paper.
than 5%
- 3 Printing is on offset Double the cost of paper.
printing machine

The above rates are applicable for Service Departments and Commercial Departments will be charged double the above rates.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

N. D. Agrawal, Director, Printing & Stationery & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 8th May, 2009.



Department of Public Health

Order

No. 38/249/2006-I/PHD/1216

Government is pleased to recognize Belgaum Cancer Hospital Pvt. Ltd., Belgaum for the purpose of Mediclaim under Goa Mediclaim Scheme for all the categories as eligible and for medical reimbursement of Government employees under the Civil Services (Medical Attendance) Rules, 1944 for the procedure "Linear Acceleration based treatment and Intracavitary Radiotherapy" which are not available in Goa Medical College.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

D. G. Sardessai, Joint Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 11th May, 2009.

Order

No. 4/14/2003-II/PHD/Vol. XXIII

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/12/30(2)/2009/71 dated 09-03-2009, the Government is pleased to declare Smt. Medha Naik, Supdt. of Dietetics in Goa Medical College to have satisfactorily completion of her two years probation period from 19-11-2004 to 18-11-2006.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Derrick Pereira Neto, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 11th May, 2009.

Order

No. 4/14/2003-II/PHD/Vol. III

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/12/30(1)/2009/50 dated 16-02-2009, the Government is pleased to declare Dr. Silvano C. A. Dias Sapeco, Professor in Forensic Medicine, Goa Medical College to have satisfactorily completion of his two years probation period from 09-04-2003 to 08-04-2005.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Derrick Pereira Neto, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 11th May, 2009.

Order

No. 4/14/2003-II/PHD/Vol. XXIV

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission conveyed vide their letter No. COM/II/12/30(4)/2008/75 dated 10-03-2009, the Government is pleased to confirm the following officers in Goa Medical College in the posts shown against their names with immediate effect:-

Sr. No.	Name of Officer	Post to which confirmed
1	Dr. (Mrs.) Clare S. D'Mello	Medical Officer in Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa.
2	Dr. Sanjay P. Korgaonkar	Medical Officer in Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa.
3	Dr. Poonam Tiwari	Medical Officer in Goa Medical College, Bambolim-Goa.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Derrick Pereira Neto, Under Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 11th May, 2009.

www.goagovt.nic.in/gazette.htm

GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS,
PANAJI-GOA.
PRICE-Rs. 8.00